***

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

R.S.A. No. 2972 of 2002

Date of decision: 21.8.2007

Bhupinder Singh **...Appellant**

Versus

Rani **...Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL

Present: Mr. Rahul Dharotia, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. K.K.Bansal, Advocate for the respondent.

****

RAJESH BINDAL, J.

This is defendant's second appeal in a suit filed by the respondent claiming expenses for her marriage from the appellant-father, who was living separately from the mother and had infact contracted second marriage. Mother of the respondent had expired on August 2, 1995. Learned trial Court awarded a sum of Rs. 4 lacs for the marriage of the respondent, however, in appeal the amount was reduced to Rs. 3 lacs from Rs. 4 lacs. The appellant is before this Court seeking further reduction of the amount from Rs. 3 lacs.

I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of both the parties.

The notice in the present appeal was issued only on the question of quantum. Learned counsel for the appellant states that Rs. 3 lacs is too high an amount for marriage and the same deserves to be reduced. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the respondent states that seeing the high costs of living and the inflation in the market, the value of the money having gone down ever since the suit was filed by the respondent/plaintiff in December, 1997, the sum of Rs. 3 lacs is a very

***

small amount and prayed for dismissal of the appeal.

I find substance in the contention raised by learned counsel for the respondent that the suit was filed way back in 1997 when the respondent claimed a sum of Rs. 5 lacs, however, she was awarded a sum of Rs. 4 lacs, which were reduced in appeal to Rs. 3 lacs. Seeing the present day costs of living and the expenses even on simple marriage, I do not consider that a sum of Rs. 3 lacs awarded in favour of the respondent is exhorbitant or require any reduction especially when the mother of the respondent had also expired and the children of the appellant are living with their maternal uncle.

Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

August 21, 2007 **(Rajesh Bindal)**
Pka **Judge**